DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 748 CG 006 054

AUTHOR Krauskopf, C. J.; And Others
TITLE The University of Missouri Survey of Counseling Psychologists. A Search and Identify Mission. The Counseling Psychologist Discovered: "Who Are They and How Did They Get That Way?" Counseling Psychology - The Error of the Assumed Essence.
INSTITUTION Auburn Univ., Ala.; Missouri Univ., Columbia.; Texas Univ., Austin.
PUB DATE 5 Sep 70
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, September 3-8, 1970

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS *Behavioral Sciences, Counseling, Counselor Educators, *Counselor Functions, Counselor Role, Counselors, *Counselor Training, Professional Education, Professional Occupations, *Professional Personnel, Professional Training, Psychological Services, *Psychologists

ABSTRACT

The data presented are the findings of a survey of counseling psychology graduates from all schools offering doctorates between 1962 and 1967. A stratified sample of 208 graduates was selected. Responses were elicited on such survey items as: (1) the quality and make-up of their doctoral programs; (2) whether or not they are members of APA; (3) their educational background; (4) the amount of research carried on since graduation; (5) which journals they read; and (6) types of work and settings in which they function. A discrepancy was found between counseling psychologists' preparation and their actual performance, professional identification, and primary job functions. The scientist-practitioner dichotomy was supported. A reorganization of doctoral training and a change in the professional role and functions of counseling psychologists is seen as inevitable. (TL)

ED044748

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The University of Missouri Survey of Counseling Psychologists

A Search and Identify Mission*

C. J. Krauskopf, University of Missouri
Robert Brabham, Auburn University

This study was born of frustration. The Division of Counseling Psychology is one of the larger ones in the APA, but few other psychologists seem to know it exists. How many psychology departments train counseling psychologists? Moreover, how many of them make any differentiation between counseling and clinical psychology? If counseling psychologists are not coming from training programs in psychology, where are they coming from? Are they clinicians who decided to call themselves counselors? Are they educational psychologists? Are they "psychologists" at all? A look at a compendium of counseling theories such as Patterson's suggests that the gods of the field are a miscellaneous collection of personality theorists, clinicians, and psychiatrists, few of whom have any identification with counseling as a field. The priests of the field, the officers of Division 17 and APGA, the writers of how to do it books, primarily find their employment in departments of education. In checking what the textbooks tell beginning students about us we find an interesting situation. Of 16 general psychology texts, 8 do not mention counseling psychology at all, 5 subsume it as a second rate clinical skill and 3 differentiate counseling psychology. Of 8 educational psychology texts, 3 do not mention counseling, 4 assume it as a subfield (mostly calling it guidance) and one differentiates counseling psychology as a separate field. Of 2 books explaining professional psychology one does a good job of explaining our field, the other tells us about "....counseling which is dying out as a separate specialty."

CG 006 054

If all this is true where are counseling psychologists being trained? Who is being trained in the various programs called counseling, counseling psychology, counselor education, etc.? What are their interests? Where do they work? How do they identify themselves? Do they do any research? In short, is counseling psychology dying or is there a field with which young people can identify.

To answer these questions we decided to survey all programs which claim to produce doctorates with the label counseling attached. There turned out to be over 100 departments with doctoral programs in departments of psychology, education, counseling, educational psychology, counselor education and more. More than 1000 doctorates were granted by these departments in the period 1962-1967. A sample of 200 was selected from these, stratifying by size of program, APA non APA-approved programs and eliminating all programs who had not produced at least 5 doctorates in the period. With three followups we received an 80% return. We were surprised to find that half of these people belong to APA and not surprised to find that less than half commonly identify themselves as counseling psychologists. They are doing reasonably well financially. They do research and, by their own evaluation, do research on counseling. And, they publish. At this point I am going to present some conclusions and let some of the data come later. Inferring from the journals counselors find useful and read, and from their work settings, training, and other activities, it appears to me that the field of counseling psychology is both thriving and dying. We appear to have created a group which is active, publishes and in other ways keeps busy, but which is hiding its talents under a bushel. The publications appear to be for an ingroup audience, either never reaching the mainstream of psychology or considered unimportant by it. Work settings are often administrative and

isolated from both academic psychology and actual counseling. It somewhat resembles a dog chasing its tail, very busy but not getting anywhere. There seems to be a lively field here, with substantial numbers of energetic, capable people with substantial problems in both academic and professional identification.

*Part of a symposium on "Counseling Psychology: Its Quest for Professional Identity" presented at the 1970 annual meeting of the American Psychological Association sponsored by Division 17.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Counseling Psychologist Discovered: "Who Are They and How Did They Get That Way?"*

Charles A. McAleer, University of Missouri
Randall Parker, University of Texas

The data to be presented are the findings of a survey of counseling psychology graduates from all schools offering doctorates during the period 1962-1967. Each school was asked to submit a list of their graduates and a stratified random sample was drawn from the resulting subject pool. Schools were classified according to the number of degrees granted during the period in the fashion Group I 5-10 graduates, Group II 11-17, Group III 18-25, and Group IV 26 or more. We surveyed a total of 208 graduates with a return rate of 80%. Returned surveys represented graduates of 51 separate graduate programs.

While we are using the term "counseling psychologist" throughout the presentation of this data, it should be pointed out that in our sample only 23% of the subjects chose that as their primary identifying professional title. We would also like to state that we are presenting only a summary view of the data in that the amount of data we presently have available is such that it would not be possible to present it all at this time. For that reason we have decided to emphasize certain portions of the data rather heavily as we feel it might be more valuable than sketchily covering more of the material. As we cover the data during this segment there are two primary questions which we feel might be helpful for the members of the audience and participants to keep in mind. (1) What is the professional identification of the counselors surveyed and to what can we relate it? (2) In what professional areas do they fuction and how do they relate to their education? (Is a re-examination of the educational process in order in light of the findings?)

CG 006 054

Briefly our data indicate the following general characteristics:

In counseling 85% of the graduates at the doctoral level are men. The mean age of our sample was 39.4. We found that only 46% of the graduates had had an internship as part of the doctoral training. The mean length of those internships was 11.4 months. With regard to their doctoral training, the subjects as a group felt most well prepared in Counseling and Psychotherapy, Tests and Measurements, and Counseling Practice, and least well prepared in Social and Experimental Psychology.

With regard to contribution to professional competency, the group ranked Doctoral training first, Work Experience second, Master's training third, Bachelor's fourth, and other Experience fifth.

At the time of the survey, 52% were members of APA and 76% of APGA. 58% had published research with the mean number of publications for the entire group being 3.3 and for those who had published 5.6.

The mean number of jobs held since graduation was 1.9 and the mean salary range was $15,000 - $17,500.

Their educational background was well distributed with 39% M.A., 23% M.S., 26% M.Ed., 40% B.S., and 51% B.A.

If you will take note of the survey question numbered 8 relating to professional titles, there is a considerable degree of scatter among the responses with the major points of concentration being the titles, "counseling psychologist," "counselor-educator," and "counselor." Conversely, there is a relative sparcity of individuals indicating a high preference for the title "psychologist," "research psychologist," and "behavioral scientist." In general, the phrases using the term "psychologist" in one way or another tend to be less popular than are those emphasizing education, counseling and school roles.

Therefore, there seems to be a trend to dissociate one's self from the primary identification of psychology as a behav-

ioral science. Considering these factors, we thought it fruitful to break down the data for this particular item on the basis of persons receiving a Ph. D. as compared with those receiving a Ed.D. (approximately 50% in each). A fairly heavy proportion of Ph. D.'s (42% chose either 1 or 11 as first title) emphasize their role as a psychologist; whereas, Doctors of Education tend to comparatively de-emphasize that role. However, the significant fact remains that there is still very little emphasis placed on the role of the counseling psychologist as a behavioral scientist. The titles "research psychologist" and "behavioral scientist" still seem to take very low priority as choice titles.

This particular item then must certainly bear relevance to the issues raised in the beginning. It is fairly obvious that there is a de-emphasis among those surveyed with regard to their identity as researchers. On the other hand, there is a major emphasis on the roles of counselor and educator.

As a point of interest we also broke the data down on the basis of APA - non-APA members, with 53% returns in the former and 47% in the latter. We had expected a higher concentration of emphasis on research aspects of counseling psychology in the titles chosen by APA members. While the APA members were relatively higher in this respect, the degree of difference was insignificant.

Some 58% of the subjects reported that they had published research since they had received their doctorate. There is a higher percentage (65%) of Ph. D.'s reporting research published than Ed.D's (53%). When we turn, however, to unpublished research there is somewhat of a reversal, with 78% of the Doctors of Education reporting unpublished research, whereas 77% of the Ph.D.'s did. We might speculate some similarity in terms of minor applied forms of research with less rigorous controls, etc.

What then do counseling psychologists on the whole consider to be the prominent areas of research? The two primary areas of emphasis are the first two on the list submitted for consideration; that is, Counseling and Psychotherapy, and Tests and Measurements. Interestingly enough, Tests and Measurements received

almost as many (20%) first choices as did Counseling and Psychotherapy (23%). It might be considered that the one form of research while being perhaps potentially more profitable is certainly more difficult to deal with.

I call your attention to the relative scarcity of research in some of the newer areas related to counseling, especially the areas of Learning(19% of total) and Social Psychology (16% of total). Given some of the newer emphases in the field, one cannot help but be optimistic that these areas will receive increased scrutiny by practitioners and academicians.

There is an obvious continuance of emphasis on the areas of Counseling and Psychotherapy and Tests and Measurements from the graduate study research to later forms of research as would be predicted. It would be expected that research interests would be related to reading interest as represented by journals which were read and considered useful by the subjects. Of the numerous journals listed on the questionnaire, three journals received particularly heavy emphasis as being read by most of the subjects questioned. Those three journals are The American Psychologist, The Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision, and the Personnel and Guidance Journal. At the same time there is less emphasis on the Journal of Counseling Psychology, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, and so on.

Let us turn now to a breakdown of the types of work and settings in which counseling psychology graduates function within the period two to six years following graduation. Among the individuals sampled, we find that a total of 70% see their main job location as the university; whereas, in descending order, smaller percentages work in institutional settings, public school settings, boards of education, private schools, private educational corporations, industry settings and private practice. Breaking their duties down by function, some 40% were found to be working in primarily administrative positions, 32% in teaching, and 24% reported counseling as their major function. Much smaller percentages are in research and test administration.

With the obvious heavy emphasis on university settings, we made additional comparisons in order to see what the majority of subjects in that setting saw as their primary function. Teaching was viewed as the primary function of counseling graduates with 47% of the subjects (in universities) relating that as their primary function. Close behind were those seeing administration as their primary function with 32%. This is particularly significant considering the youth of the population sampled with a trend apparent for change to administrative function based on the year of graduation.

As would be expected from the previous data, 16% were primarily involved in counseling while only one individual saw research as his primary function. When one considers the large number of individuals who expressed their university major as counseling psychology, etc., and the relatively few who considered their background to be that of education administration, university administration, higher education, etc., one must raise the issue of the relevancy of their graduate training as compared with their job functions only two to six years following graduation.

Summary and Conclusions

The foregoing data, then, provide us with some basis for assessing and examining the educational process and its relevance for the future professional identification and the job functions of counseling psychologist. As you have noted, we have not included consideration of many of the current trends in counseling psychology, e.g., community procedures, group counseling. However, we believe that they are relevant to the issue and wish you would bear them in mind when re-considering the educational process we are in. There is apparent discrepancy between the preparation of counseling psychologists and their actual performance, professional identification, and primary job functions upon graduation. It is not necessary to imply that the things prepared for in graduate training are unessential or unimportant, but it does seem apparent that there are gaps in the educational process if the counseling

psychologist continues to function as he apparently now is.

*Part of a symposium on "Counseling Psychology: Its Quest for Professional Identity" presented at the 1970 annual meeting of the American Psychological Association sponsored by Division 17.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Counseling Psychology - The Error of the Assumed Essence*

Richard W. Thoreson, University of Missouri

Is Counseling Psychology primarily a body of explanatory constructs related to certain segments of human behavior? Or is it a guild of workers who perform similar job tasks? Leslie White (1969) in The Science of Culture opts for the explanatory constructs definition of science. And he warns us that the latter view of science as "a vast terrain divided into a number of 'fields' each tilled by its own appropriately named guild (p. 4)" - leads not only to jurisdictional disputes but to such questions as to whether a particular field is, indeed, a science. Counseling psychology as a professional area is obviously a loosely connected guild of professional workers bonded together principally by similar job tasks and only peripherally by similarity in subject matter. It is, consequently, subject to jurisdictional disputes with other applied areas and invidious comparisons with other elitist guilds in psychology. It is our thesis that changes will inevitably occur in this loose federation of workers that we now refer to as counseling psychology. These changes will be reflected both in doctoral training in applied areas of psychology and in the professional role and functions of counseling psychologists.

Our survey is based upon a random sample from our universe of over 1000 graduates from the 51 schools granting doctorates in counseling and related areas who had 5 or more graduates during the period June 1, 1962 to September 30, 1966. Data from the survey indicate that though the majority of counseling psychologists work in college and university settings (70%) their principle job title is administrative with teaching and counseling titles lagging somewhat behind and research titles virtually nonexistent.

CG 006 054

Our data reveal, not unexpectedly, that counseling psychologist is selected most frequently as the title "with which you would use to refer to yourself" by our sample. In the pooled rankings, however, the five titles and their ranks are: (1) Counselor (2) Counseling Psychologist (3) Psychologist (4) Counselor Educator (5) Other(s). The category "others" includes a variety of administrative titles such as "Dean of Student Affairs", "Director of Pupil Personnel", "College President", "Professor of Counseling and Guidance", and "Student Personnel and Student Personnel Educator". The data suggest that a majority of the doctorates in counseling who participated in our survey do not see themselves primarily as psychologists, either in the scientific or professional sense of the word. This is somewhat ironic since 53% of our sample indicate membership in APA, a percentage very similar to that found in other areas within psychology. Our data also suggest that doctorates in counseling publish at a rate (3.6 mean publication rate) equivalent to that reported by Levy (1962) for clinical psychologists.

Counseling psychology is, it seems, an uneasy blend of scientific-academic components which includes a body of abstract knowledge and procedures of long range relevance and professional (guild) components of short range relevance. It is a curious fact that the professional literature in counseling psychology shows a dearth of discussion of the problems pursuant with the guild definition of counseling psychology and seems unconcerned by the somewhat anguished cries of pain and roars of anger wafting through the air from the skirmishes of clinical psychology and academic psychology over scientific and professional (guild) priorities.

Our data provides some insight into professional problems and suggests new directions for counseling psychology.

For better or for worse, our data indicate that the majority of doctorates in counseling come from non APA approved schools and, as such, do not meet the more rigorous definitions of counseling psychologist. And there are differences between the graduates of

APA approved and non-APA approved programs in counseling psychology. Graduates from the APA approved programs are shaped more along scientific-academic lines than are their non-APA approved counterparts. Graduates from approved programs are more prone to identify themselves as counseling psychologists or psychologists; they join APA at higher rates; they publish at higher rates; they read more and differently (more in the hard psychology area); they express a greater interest in teaching and research as compared to their non-APA counterparts. Conversely, graduates from non-APA approved programs publish less, read less and indicate less of a primary identification as psychologist and more of an emphasis on counseling.

Fortunately, our data also suggests certain confounding factors and interactions. There is a marked clustering of responses to the survey by four overlapping groups: (1) graduates of APA approved programs, (2), APA members, (3) those indicating the Ph. D. as the highest degree received, and (4) those indicating counseling psychologist as the first choice of professional titles. As compared to all others, respondents in these four categories tend to be younger, to publish at a higher rate, to read more journals, to share a common professional identification as counseling psychologists and belong to APA. Within group differences for these four categories also provide illuminating contrasts. Respondents from APA approved programs are more likely to indicate greater time spent in teaching and research, indicate tests and measurements as the area of their Ph. D. research and read more professional journals than members in the other three categories. Those who list counseling psychologist as their primary professional title, as contrasted with all others, are more likely to have done research in counseling, publish more frequently in the area of counseling and psychotherapy, and tend to rate the adequacy of their preparation in experimental psychology as somewhat inadequate. Ph. D.'s as contrasted with the other three groups, are likely to indicate a shorter internship, an equal balance between counseling

and psychotherapy and tests and measurements as the research area for their Ph. D. dissertation and to rate their academic preparation in professional problems in psychology as somewhat inadequate. They share with the counseling psychologist group the conduct of research in counseling and psychotherapy.

We may infer, thusly, that those with either a primary counseling psychologist identification and those indicating Ph. D. as the highest degree attained are similar to each other and similar to respondents from non-APA approved programs and non-publishers in indicating more time spent in counseling and more research done (though presumably unpublished) in the area of counseling and psychotherapy.

APA members, Ph. D.'s and those ranking counseling psychology as their primary professional title rate their college preparation as somewhat inadequate in the experimental or professional problems area of psychology.

Those from APA approved programs rate their academic programs as adequate in all the professional areas.

The identification in our survey of relatively discrete groups of practitioners and scientific-academic types supports the scientist-practitioner dichotomy in psychology.

Grossman (1963) presaged the present polarization in psychology. Grossman at the time urged existing psychological organizations - state, regional, divisional, and national - to take heed of the needs and demands of service-oriented psychologists and place high on the agenda problems of professionalization. He affirmed that

> it is incumbent on the mature academic psychologist in crucial, high positions to take cognizance of the recent trends, to protect and further the needs of all psychologists, rather than to attempt to maintain the status quo or adopt the 'ostrich' approach. --On the other hand, the 'young turks' must calm their impatience and realize, too, that part of being mature is maintaining perspective, being statesmanlike and objective, and realize that broad, sound changes do not come about overnight. If both groups do not have this maturity, a split is bound to occur, and psychology and society will be the losers (pp. 569-570).

The description of the California School of Professional Psychology (Pottharst 1970) gives to his remarks a certain prophetic quality:

> Since we are professionals, we simply propose to reverse the priorities and train psychologists who are professionals first and scientists second, clinicians who are clinicians first and researchers second. In this way we aim to bring the priorities in training into line with what have been recognized for years as realities of professional practice and at the same time to breath new life into less ritualized, less formalized research that is more meaningful and relevant. We are proposing a concept of training which recognizes that professional psychology no longer solely represents an out-growth of academic psychology departments. (p.124)

I would suggest that this training model reflects, in part, the present trend toward anti-intellectualism in our society.

Daddario (1968) speaks warily of the growing mood of the anti-intellectualism in our country. He believes that academic science provides the proper balance of intelligent and objective attitudes needed in a time of change; and he further suggests that the research and training capabilities of the academic community are badly needed in a time of dangerous polarity in our country.

Loren Eiseley (1969) warns us in colofrul language that:

> in our streets and on our campuses riots an extremist minority dedicated to the now, to the moment, however absurd, degrading or irrelevant the moment may be. It is an activism that deliberately rejects the past and is determined to start life anew--indeed to reject the very institutions that feed, clothe, and sustain our swarming millions--for man's story, in brief, is essentially that of a creature who has abandoned instinct and replaced it with cultural tradition and the hardworn increments of contemplative thought. The lessons of the past have been found to be reasonably secure instruction for proceeding against the unknown future. To hurl oneself recklessly, without method, upon the future that we ourselves have contemplated is a sheer nihilistic rejection of all that history, including the classical world, can teach us (p.129).

Are psychologists exhibiting concern for social relevance? The answer is an equivocal "yes". First it may be noted that in an era of mounting social problems, students are placing great pressure on their professors to reexamine attitudes toward their

discipline. Psychology, initially concerned with guild building and with establishing legitimacy is now demonstrating a genuine concern for developing increased social consciousness. George Miller, past president of APA, is quoted as stating that tensions between academic psychologists and practitioners have now been resolved (News and Comment, Science, 1969). I could not concur with this. Sigmund Koch asks the rhetorical question:

> 'Is psychology socially relevant?' As any backlog of scientific knowledge, psychology has very little to offer. Society expects more than we have to provide. It is a very unhappy situation. Those beautiful black students - these are the people who are asking desperately to be taken into our field, but the trouble is that psychology has no answers in respect to the problems that they are concerned about. The main thing we can do is contribute to our respect for the multiplicity of factors which affect human behavior and the cautions which must be taken into account in describing behavior (p.1104).

Data from our survey would appear to support the thesis of inevitable change in the doctoral training and in the professional role and functions of counseling psychologists. Our respondents fit quite nicely into this tripartate model: (1) applied (professional) -- a future convergence of professional counseling and clinical psychologists; (2) academic (sciencing) -- a future convergence of scientific counseling psychology with experimental, social and clinical, verbal learning and educational psychology; (3) administrative (counselor education, personnel work) -- a convergence of counselor trainers with college student personnel work and higher education. It seems somewhat apocryphal but nevertheless true, that the abundance of administrative titles with primary administrative identificaion and secondary psychologist identification has kept counseling psychology out of the bitter life and death struggle which is now taking place between academic and professional clinical psychologists.

Now, however, it is evident that the deliciously sensuous pleasures of sensory awareness, the powerful move toward greater self awareness and authenticity found in the encounter group movement have captured the fancy of counseling psychology. Contrast the intense emotional excitement of marathon sensitivity

groups with the comments of the scientist Darwin in his introduction to Origin of the Species:

> it occurred to me, in 1837, that something might perhaps be made out on this question by patiently accumulating and reflecting on all sorts of facts which could possibly have any bearing on it. After five years work, I allowed myself to speculate on the subject.

I fear that however pleasurable and exciting the humanistic movement in counseling and clinical psychology may be, its cultishness and anti-intellectualism will lead to a splitting off of practice from its academic heritage.

The burgeoning movement within psychology appears to represent disillusionment and rebellion of psychologists against an impersonal, technological society that dominates the individual and reduces his sense of freedom. Price (1969) believes that those who express pessimism about the inevitability of progress through science and technology, though quite right, may not be pessimistic enough. It seems to him entirely possible that ever increasing amounts of technological power unfettered in an overcrowded world may overload any system we could devise for its control. Unfortunately, he also feels that rebels are too romantically optimistic in their remedy:

> Mere rebellion, mere purposelessness and violence to upset the establishment assumes that those who gain power by violence will be nobler and more generous in purpose than those who now try to hold together the delicate web of civilized institutions (p.31).

It seems apparent that doctoral programs in counseling psychology that attempt to train psychologists to serve two masters at once (trying to operate as practitioners and scientists simultaneously) are very likely to fail. It would seem probable that APA approved programs will take on a more stable scientific character. Programs preparing Ph.D.'s for administrative positions in schools and colleges will continue, possibly unaffected by the current zeitgeist. Clinical and counseling programs with professional practice as their first priority will emerge. The California School of Professional Psychology would

appear to be a prototype for future "psychological institutes" for the training of professional psychologists.

Hopefully, we will see a change in the organization of our doctoral programs in counseling psychology along the lines of applied behavioral science with training taking on a more dominant multidisciplinary flavor and, although graduate education would be an important element, the products of the program would have interest and loyalties transcending the established discipline of psychology.

The traditional guilds within psychology have in the past been too absorbed in their disciplines to work effectively on social problems. I see hope for counseling psychology as a legitimate professional area within the framework of applied behavioral science. Unfortunately, I am less optimistic about the longevity of the psychological institutes for the preparation of professional psychologists. As Jane Loevinger observes (in reference to psychoanalysis):

> one hears on all sides, even among psychoanalyists, of the decline in influence and prestige of psychoanalyists. This decline can be a salutary thing, even for psychoanalyists, to the extent that it means that those who are looking for magical solutions are seeking them elsewhere; behavioral therapy, sensitivity training, nude marathons, Zen, drugs, or large molecules. These too shall pass (Loevinger, 1969, p.1389).

* Part of a symposium on "Counseling Psychology: Its Quest for Professional Identity" presented at the 1970 annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami Beach, Florida, sponsored by Division 17, September 5, 1970.

REFERENCES

Daddario, E. Q. Academic science and the federal government. Science, 1968, 162, 1249-1251.

Darwin, C. Origin of the species. New York: Collier, Macmilan, 1962.

Eiseley, L. Activism and the reflection of history. Science, 1969, 165, p. 129.

Grossman, D. Clinical psychology: Comments and suggestions. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 568-570.

Levy, L. H. The skew in clinical psychology. American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 244-249.

Loevinger, Jane Book review of The logic of explanation in psychoanalysis. Science, 1969, 163, p. 1389.

News and Comment Psychologists searching for social relevance at APA meeting. Science, 1969, 166, 1101-1104.

Pottharst, K. E. To renew vitality and provide a challenge in training - The California School of Professional Psychology. Professional Psychology, 1970, 1, 123-130.

Price, D. K. Purist and politicians. Science, 1969, 163, 15-31.

White, L. A. The science of culture. New York: Farrar-Straus Giroux, 1969.